

REMARKS

Applicant has amended the Claim 1 and added new Claim 8. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments to the claims are supported by the application as originally filed and do not contain any new matter. Therefore, the Office Action will be discussed in terms of the claims as amended.

The Examiner has rejected the Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Katoh et al., stating that Katoh et al. discloses each and every element of Applicant's invention.

In reply thereto, Applicant would like to first point out that Applicant's invention is directed towards reducing the amount of volatile compounds emitted from the polyurethane resin foam. To achieve this end, Applicant has recognized that if one increases the molecular weight of the antioxidant used in synthesizing the polyol, and also the antioxidant used in the manufacture of the polyurethane resin foam, such volatile compounds are reduced.

With the above in mind, Applicant has carefully reviewed Katoh et al., and respectfully submits that Katoh et al. has not recognized this matter at all. Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in Katoh et al. concerning the synthesizing antioxidant and particularly that the synthesizing antioxidant should have a molecular weight above a certain level. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Katoh et al. does not disclose anything concerning the molecular weight of the antioxidant used in manufacturing the polyurethane resin foam and particularly does not disclose that the amount of all the compounds released or emitted can be reduced by increasing the molecular weight of the antioxidant used in the manufacture of the polyurethane foam. Still further, Applicant respectfully submits that it is not inherent that the utilization of an antioxidant in Katoh et al. would reduce the volatile compounds since by Applicant's experimentation, it has been found the addition of low molecular weight antioxidants does not reduce the amount of volatile compounds.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Claims 1-7 are not anticipated by Katoh et al.

The Examiner has rejected the Claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Kinoshita et al., Class, Sanok, et al. or Yamamoto, et al., each taken individually, stating that each discloses all the elements of the present invention.

In reply thereto, Applicant respectfully submits that none of this art now cited by the Examiner recognizes or teaches anything about reducing the amount of volatile compounds

emitted by the polyurethane foam, and particularly does not teach that this could be achieved by increasing the molecular weight of the antioxidant used in production of not only the polyol, but also the polyurethane foam itself.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Claims 1-5 are not anticipated by Kinoshita et al., Clauss, Sanok et al. or Yamamoto et al., each taken individually.

The Examiner has further rejected the Claims 1-7 provisionally under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being obvious over Claims 1-17 of copending application 10/752,028. Submitted herewith is a terminal disclaimer, and Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, therefore, it is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered, favorably considered, and the case passed to issue.

Please charge any additional costs incurred by or in order to implement this amendment or required by any requests for extensions of time to KODA & ANDROLIA DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 11-1445.

Respectfully submitted,

KODA & ANDROLIA

By 

William L. Androlia

Reg. No. 27,177

2029 Century Park East, Suite 1140
Los Angeles, California 90067-2983
Tel: 310-277-1391
Fax: 310-277-4118

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on September 27, 2005.


William L. Androlia

Not to

Signature

9/27/2005

Date